

The Signs of the Times, vol. 18

esr

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1891	4
November 9, 1891	4
"The Foundations of God's Government" The Signs of the Times, 18, 1.	4
November 16, 1891	9
"Doers of the Law" The Signs of the Times, 18, 2.	9
November 23, 1891	14
"Justified by Faith" The Signs of the Times, 18, 3.	14
JUSTIFICATION HONORS THE LAW	16
November 30, 1891	20
"Justification and Sanctification" The Signs of the Times, 18, 4.	20
THE MAN'S FUTURE RELATION	23
December 7, 1891	26
"Christ the End of the Law" The Signs of the Times, 18, 5.	26
WHAT DOES IT MEAN?	28
December 14, 1891	31
"God in Government" The Signs of the Times, 18, 6.	31
ITS RESULTS	34
December 21, 1891	37
"Lock that Door" The Signs of the Times, 18, 7.	37
"Lock that Door	37
December 28, 1891	41
"Conditional Immortality" The Signs of the Times, 18, 8.	41
1892	43
October 24, 1892	43
"The Testimony of the Bible to Itself" The Signs of the Times, 18, 50.	43

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: Vol. 17 was stopped at No. 42, October 26, 1891. Vol. 18 goes from No. 1, November 9, 1891 through No. 50, October 24, 1892.]

1891

November 9, 1891

“The Foundations of God’s Government” *The Signs of the Times*, 18, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

There is one more argument that we would introduce right here. To do so we shall have to refer to the tabernacle built by Moses, and we shall try to do so as briefly as is consistent with perfect clearness. In general, only references will be given; the reader can look them up at his leisure. *SITI November 9, 1891, page 5.1*

In *Exodus 25:8* we read these words. “And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.” These words of the Lord follow a command to Moses to receive offerings of gold, silver, brass, acacia wood, fine linen, goat’s hair, etc. Of these the tabernacle was to be built. *Chapters 25-30* contain the complete description of this structure, together with all the furniture and vessels connected with it. *SITI November 9, 1891, page 5.2*

Within this tabernacle were various articles of furniture. Just within the holy place on the north side, was a table, upon which shewbread was place. *Exodus 25:23-30; 40:22, 23*. On the south side there was a candlestick, or lamp stand, having seven lamps, the whole beaten out of one solid piece of gold. These lamps were to be kept continually burning. *Exodus 25:31-39*. In the western extremity of the holy place, just before the second vail, was the golden altar of incense. Upon this the priests offered incense night and morning. *Exodus 30:1-9*. This is all that was in the holy place. In the most holy place there was but one article of furniture, the ark of the testimony (*Exodus 25:10-22*), and that is of so much importance in our investigation that we shall examine it more particularly. *SITI November 9, 1891, page 5.3*

By a careful examination of the scripture last referred to we find that this ark was an oblong box of acacia wood, covered within and without with gold. On its dies were rings of gold, through which staves were passed for use in carrying it, so that it need never be

touched by human hands. The cover to this ark was called the mercy seat, and was of solid gold. Upon the mercy seat were cherubim, one on each side of solid gold, and of the same piece as the mercy seat itself. The wings of these cherubim were extended so as to form an arch over the ark, and their faces looked toward each other, and downward to the ark. Within the ark was the “testimony,” (*Exodus 25:16*), which was nothing other than the ten commandments, which God spoke from Sinai, wrote on tables of stone, and delivered to Moses for safe deposit in the ark (*Deuteronomy 10:1-5*). This ark, as stated before, was in the most holy place (*Hebrews 9:1, 2*), into which no man could enter save the high priest, and he only once a year (*Hebrews 9:7*). Even then he did not see the ark, because the cloud of incense arising from the censer which he held in his hand, entirely concealed it. *Leviticus 16:12, 13*. Without this precaution, he would have died, and the reason why will presently appear. Turning to *Exodus 25:20-22*, we read:—*SITI November 9, 1891, page 5.4*

“And the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubim be. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.”*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.1*

Now we know why no one except the high priest could enter the most holy place, and why even he, in his yearly visit, could not behold the mercy seat and live. It was because the glory of God was there. In that place the priest was in the immediate presence of God.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.2*

It is now time to inquire how Moses, after having been commanded to build the sanctuary, happened to light upon the special style that he did. For an answer, read *Exodus 25:9, 40*. “According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.” “And look that

thou make them after their pattern, which was shewed thee in the mount.” Since it was to be God’s house, God himself furnished the plan. But by reading a little more we shall find that this pattern was not something then for the first time conceived. In the ninth of Hebrews, Paul, after telling that Moses purified (in a figure) the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, by sprinkling them with the blood of animals, says (*verse 23*): “It was therefore necessary that *the patterns of things in the heavens* should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.” This tells us plainly that the tabernacle and its furniture were copied after things in the heavens. “Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum; we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” *Hebrews 8:1, 2. SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.3*

Now we know that the tabernacle built by Moses as a dwelling-place for God, was only a temporary representation of God’s real, permanent dwelling-place in heaven. That God does have a tangible structure in heaven for his occupancy, where, to use a common expression, he holds court, is evident from the scripture just quoted, and also from *Psalms 11:4*: “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in heaven: his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.” This temple, the place of God’s throne, has been seen in heaven. John says: “And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament.” *Revelation 11:19. SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.4*

If we should ask what portion of the earthly tabernacle especially represented God’s throne, the reader would almost at once answer: “The ark, with the cherubim on the mercy seat above; because it was between these cherubim that his glory was manifested.” This would be correct. God’s actual dwelling-place is between the cherubim; when he moves from place to place, his throne (a living throne) and the cherubim accompany him. For proof of this read the following texts:—*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.5*

“Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth.” *Psalms*

80:1.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.6*

“The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubims; let the earth be moved.” *Psalm 99:1*. Besides these, read *Ezekiel 1* and *10*, *Isaiah 6:1-3*, and *Ezekiel 28:14*.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.7*

Remember now that everything in the earthly sanctuary was a representation of some corresponding thing in the heavenly sanctuary, as nearly exact as human hands could approach to a likeness of things not made with hands, and we shall of necessity conclude that the throne of God in heaven is directly above the original law of ten commandments, of which the tables placed in the ark by Moses were only a copy. In other words, the ten commandments form the foundation of God's throne.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.8*

In further pursuit of this thought read *Psalm 89:14*: “Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face.” Also the following: “The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne.” *Psalm 97:1, 2*. We have already learned that the law is holy, just, and good, and that it is righteousness; it is perfect righteousness, and there is no righteousness outside of this law of ten commandments. Therefore when the Psalmist says that righteousness is the establishment of God's throne, it is equivalent to saying that God's throne is established upon the ten commandments; that the ten commandments literally form the basis, or foundation, of the throne of God.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.9*

The term “throne” is often applied to sovereign authority or royal dignity. The ruler of a country is the representative of that government, and by metonymy the place where the ruler dispenses justice is put for the ruler, and so for the government. We speak of “the throne of the universe,” meaning thereby the government of the universe. So, then, the fact that the ten commandments are the foundation of God's throne, shows that they are the rule of his government; that every act is in accordance with their just

sanctions; and that all the creatures of his government throughout the universe are required to obey them.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.10*

This is a conclusion which we are confident cannot be overthrown, nor can anyone who holds himself to a strict regard for the plain word of God, contradict it. This being so, what a view it gives us to the perpetuity of God's law! Leaving the eternity that is past, we look forward and ask, How long shall God's moral law endure? And the answer comes: It will endure just as long as God's throne endures, just as long as God rules the universe; for God's throne could not remain firm if its foundations were destroyed.*SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.11*

And this shows the unchanging nature of the law, as well as its perpetuity. The moral law is composed to ten precepts. Since the law is the foundation of God's throne, we may with propriety call the ten precepts the ten stones composing the foundation. Indeed, Bishop E. O. Haven, of the M. E. Church, seemed to have a similar idea in his mind, when he wrote the little book entitled, "The Pillars of Truth." This work contains ten chapters, each chapter being the substance of a lecture before the students of Michigan University, the subject of the lectures being the ten commandments. These commandments, according to the bishop's idea, are the ten pillars that uphold all truth. This being true, how can one of them be exchanged for another? What would support the throne of the universe while the transfer was being made? Such a question needs no answer. When we realize the relation which the moral law sustains to God and his government, the mind at once sees the absurdity of the idea that one jot or one tittle can pass from the law, or that the slightest change could ever be made in it. We must exclaim with the Psalmist: "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." *Psalms 119:160. SITI November 9, 1891, page 6.12*

November 16, 1891

“Doers of the Law” *The Signs of the Times*, 18, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

In previous articles we have laid down some of the fundamental principles of the law. We have found that the moral law of ten commandments, spoken from Sinai, is perfect, holy, and good; that it is the instrument which enables us to judge between good and evil; that it is “the righteousness of God,” so that there is no goodness or morality to be found outside of it; that it is also called “the way,” “the way of peace,” “the truth,” “the testimony,” the “word of the Lord,” etc., and that it is the express of God’s will; that the transgression of it is sin, which makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached, so that whoever admits the existence of sin, and the necessity for the preaching of the gospel, virtually testifies to the existence of the law; more than this, we have learned that, as the righteousness of God, it is the foundation of his throne, the basis of his government of the universe, and that it was therefore in full force before this world was brought into existence, and that it will continue in force as long as God’s throne endures, the delight of all the redeemed throughout eternity. *SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.13*

These points must be borne in mind as we proceed to their application in this examination of special texts. In this examination the points mentioned above will be strengthened, if it is possible to strengthen a position already so strong. *SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.14*

We have already quoted *Romans 2:13*: “For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” This statement of the apostle’s is unqualified, and admits of no qualification. The doers of the law shall be justified. The statement is positive and emphatic. There can be no qualification nor exception. Think a moment. It is the righteousness of God, the perfection of holiness. Must not the keeping of it, then, as Solomon says, be “the whole duty of man”? and if a man does his whole duty, and is a partaker of the righteousness of God, can he be

condemned?—Not by any means. God himself has declared, through his inspired apostle, that “the doer of the law shall be justified.” Wherever in the universe a being is found who is a doer of the law, he is just in the sight of God.*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.15*

Already I hear someone exclaim, “He thinks that man can save himself by his own works, and leaves no room for Christ.” Not so fast; do not pass judgment upon a piece of work until it is completed. Perhaps the proposition will seem clearer if we consider what constitutes one a “*doer of the law*.” Let us illustrate: A father goes from home, leaving his son a certain amount of work to perform. There is a portion of work for each hour,—enough to keep the son constantly employed. Suppose that the son works faithfully for an hour or two, and then consumes the remainder of the time in play; has he done what his father commanded?—Certainly not. But suppose that he works faithfully every hour but one, and leaves the work allotted to that hour unperformed; can he now be called a doer of his father’s will?—He evidently cannot. Unless he can truthfully say, “I have done what my father left for me to do,” he cannot be called a doer of his father’s will; and he cannot truthfully say that he has done what his father gave him to do, unless he has done *all* that was enjoined upon him.*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.16*

This is more than a simple illustration; it is a plain statement of fact. The boy cannot be said to have done what his father told him to do, if he has not done it all; a man cannot be said to have traveled the road from one point to another, if he lacks a mile of it; even so no man can be called a “doer of the law” of God, if he has ever violated one of its precepts. If there be a man who has kept every commandment but one, and has violated that one but a single time, he cannot be called a *doer of the law*, and hence cannot be justified by the law. He would be *almost a doer of the law*, but there is no promise of justification for those who simply almost do the law.*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.17*

Right in this connection we must read the words of James: “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [or that law which said], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no

adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.”
James 2:10, 11. SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.18

Many people, in their shortsightedness, have thought that this is unjust. There is no injustice in it; it is simply a statement of what exists from the very nature of things. The apostle does not say that the man who breaks only one commandment shall be considered as guilty as he who should violate every one, although he is guilty of all. There are degrees of sin. The law is sometimes likened to a chain having ten links. Now if only one link be broken, the chain is broken, and, until that link is mended, is just as useless as though all the links were broken. So if a man breaks one commandment, he has broken the law, and it is just as impossible for the law to justify him as it would be if he had broken every precept. The following from Dr. Chalmers is directly on this point:—*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.19*

“In order that you [may] feel the force of the apostle’s demonstration, there is one principle which is held to be sound in human law, and which, in all equity, ought to be extended to the law of God. The principle is this,—that however manifold the enactments of the law may be, it is possible, by one act or one kind of disobedience, to incur the guilt of an entire defiance to the authority which framed it; and therefore to bring rightfully down upon the head of the transgressor the whole weight of the severities which it denounces against the children of iniquity. To be worthy of death, it is not necessary to commit all the things which are included in the sad enumeration of human vices, any more than it is necessary for a criminal to add depredation to forgery, or murder to both, ere a capital sentence go out against him from the administrators of the law upon which he has trampled. You may as effectually cut with a friend by one hostile or insolent expression, as if you had employed a thousand; and your disavowal of authority may be as intelligibly announced by one deed of defiance as by many; and your contempt of Heaven’s court be as strongly manifested by your willful violation of one of the commandments, as if you had thwarted every requirement....*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.20*

“The man who has thrown off the allegiance of religion may neither

have the occasion nor the wish to commit all the offenses which it prohibits, or to utter all the blasphemies which may be vented forth, in the spirit of defiance against the Almighty's throne. And yet the principle of defiance may have taken full possession of his heart, and irreligion may be the element in which he breathes. And in every instance, when his will comes into competition with the will of God, may the creature lift himself above the Creator; and though, according to the varieties of natural temperament, these instances may be more manifold and various with one man than with another, yet that which essentially constitutes the character of moral and spiritual guilt may be of equal strength and inveteracy with both.... ungodliness, in short, is not a thing of tale and measure; it is a thing of weight and of quality.”—*Chalmers on the Romans, Lecture VI.SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.21*

The above is a good exposition of *James 2:10, 11*. We learn, then, that when a man willfully violates one commandment, it is not respect for the law, nor for the Lawgiver, that restrains him from violating all of them. He has shown his contempt for the authority that gave them, and thus becomes guilty of all. Now when we recall the fact that each one of these commandments reaches the thoughts and intents of the heart, we may have something of a sense of what it takes to be a *doer* of the law. If it is thought that there is even one human being who merits that title, read the following plain declarations:—*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.22*

“For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” *Romans 3:9-19.SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.23*

After reading the above, you will have no difficulty in understanding why the apostle immediately adds:—*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.24*

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” *Romans 3:20.SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.25*

It seems hardly possible that anyone should now imagine that there is any disagreement between *Romans 2:13* and *Romans 3:20*. It is a fact that all must recognize, that the law will justify all doers of it; and it is just as certain that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified, because there is no one of whom it can be said, He is a doer of the law. It is not the fault of the law that it will not justify anybody; it would do so if it were possible; it is the fault of man that it cannot.*SITI November 16, 1891, page 6.26*

November 23, 1891

“Justified by Faith” *The Signs of the Times*, 18, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Before going further, let us have some definitions to keep in our mind. *Justification* is “a showing to be just, or conformable to law, rectitude, or propriety.” *Condemnation* is “the judicial act of declaring guilty, and dooming to punishment.” The two words are directly opposite in meaning; and we have the inspired declaration that all the world are guilty (condemned) before God, and that by the deeds of the law none can be justified. *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.27*

That there may be no possibility of a mistake, we will compare *Romans 2:13* and *3:20* a little further. Both are true, but they do not both apply to the same classes. The first is a universal truth. The *doers* of the law, wherever or whenever they are found, are justified. It cannot be otherwise. But in this world there are no *doers* of the law. There may be many who are trying to do it; but whatever degree of success they may have, they cannot be called *doers* of the law, for they have repeatedly broken it. Suppose now that it were possible for a man to turn squarely around the keep the law perfectly, would he be justified?—By no means. The law requires that *all there is of us* shall be devoted to it *all the time*. Then if a man gets behind, he can never catch up. Since all our strength is required for each hour, it is plain that the perfect performance of duty during any hour will not in the least degree make up for the non-performance of duty during any other hour. There can be no such things as works of supererogation. While the law justifies us in the performance of good deeds, it cannot, as a matter of fact, justify us for a single moment, no matter how good our present actions may be, since on its very first application to us, it must detect the past sin, and consequently must at once condemn us. Justification and condemnation have reference to our whole lives; and since, however good we may be for a portion of our lives, at the end it will be seen that we have not done *all* our duty, we must therefore stand condemned. The law is just and good, and therefore it can never declare a guilty man innocent. *SITI November 23, 1891, page*

Is there, then, no hope for any? Since all have sinned, must all receive the wages—death? Will the law with its unrelenting grasp forever hold all the world in the bondage of death? Such would be the case, and there would be no hope for any, had not “God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. All the world are guilty before God, because all have sinned; but they may be “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” *Romans 3:24*. There is “hope in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption.” *Psalms 130:7*. Let us read Paul’s clear statement of how we may be justified:—*SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.29*

“Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” *Romans 3:24-6. SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.30*

Take notice that this is not indulgence for sin, nor remission of the law, but *remission of sins*. The sins are remitted—sent away. By this process, the sins are taken from the individual, so that he may be counted as though he had never committed them. Note also the fact that it is by the grace of God that we are justified, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There is no antagonism between the Father and the Son; both are concerned in the great work of man’s redemption. The death of Christ, inasmuch as the Lord “laid upon him the iniquity of us all” (*Isaiah 53:6*), made it possible for God to justify those who have faith in his blood. *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.31*

“To declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.” Christ’s righteousness was perfect. He delighted to do the will of God, because the law—God’s will was within his heart. *Psalms 40:8*. He “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” *1 Peter 2:22*. He alone, of all the people who ever trod this earth, could

challenge even his enemies to find in his life one trace of sin. *John 8:46*. We have learned that righteousness is obedience to the law. Now it is because of unrighteousness-disobedience to the law-that man is condemned. If by any means a man's whole life could be made to appear in perfect harmony with the law, it is evident that that man would be justified. It is also evident that if the sins of his life could be removed, his life would appear in harmony with the law of God. Now this is just what is done. Christ's righteousness is declared for the remission-taking away-of those sins. As Christ's life is worth infinitely more than the lives of all the world, so through his death his righteousness may be made to take the place of the disobedience of all those who will have faith in him. We may say that an exchange is made: Christ takes upon himself the sins of all our past life, and in return lets his righteousness be count as ours. When this is done for a man, the law can do no other than justify him. It demands perfect obedience in the life, and that is what it finds. It matters not to the law that the obedience which it finds in the man's life is not really his own; it is counted as his own; and since the obedience is perfect, the law cannot condemn. Christ suffered the penalty for the sins which the man actually committed (*Isaiah 53:6, 10; 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Peter 2:21*), and thus God can be perfectly just and at the same time may justify a man who has sinned. But this can be done only for those who have faith in Christ's blood. *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.32*

It must not be forgotten that we are now speaking only of the sins that are *past*. It is impossible that *remission* of sins could have reference to anything else, for that which does not exist cannot be taken away; and to justify a man for sins not yet committed, in other words, to grant indulgence for sins, would throw contempt on the law, and bring in anarchy and ruin. And no sins are remitted except of those who believe in Jesus. If any are Christ's, they are Abraham's seed (*Galatians 3:29*), and therefore, with him, their faith is imputed unto them for righteousness (*James 2:23*). *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.33*

JUSTIFICATION HONORS THE LAW

"Therefore," says Paul, "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." *Romans 3:28*. This does not mean

that the law is ignored, and that a man who disregards the law can be justified. Nothing of the kind. There could be no justification in such a case; for justification has no connection with injustice, and to clear a guilty man-a violator of the law-is an act of injustice. The Lord says that he “will not at all acquit the wicked” (*Nahum 1:3*), and he does not; for the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin (*1 John 1:7*), and when this is applied to an individual, as it is to all who have faith in it, it frees him from guilt, and then he must necessarily stand justified. But the man could not be justified if the law were left out of the account; for justification, as we have already learned, is “a showing to be just or conformable to law.” *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.34*

But this will not be done for a man who does not acknowledge the justice of the law which condemns his sins, and, repenting of them, promise obedience to the law. No just governor would pardon a man under any other circumstances. Here is a man who has been convicted of theft; he petitions for a pardon, but unless he promises to reform, he will not be likely to get it. If he persists that he has a right to steal, and has no intention of reforming, nothing can secure his pardon. Of course this is not a perfect parallel to the sinner pleading with God for forgiveness; for when a man receives pardon from an earthly ruler, his guilt remains the same as ever; but when he receives a pardon from God, the same blood which secures the pardon takes away the sin. *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.35*

The statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law, is only a summing up of Paul’s argument, which we have already given. No amount of work will have the slightest effect in securing justification by the remission of past sins. That which is done we cannot undo. *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.36*

Nothing that we can do can alter the fact that we have sinned. Your past life has been full of sin, and you want to become free from the guilt of it; what can you do? Though you were able to keep the law without the slightest deviation, that would not remove a single sin. You can do nothing but “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.” He says: “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden [with sin], and I will give you rest.” *Matthew 11:28*. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. So we conclude, with Paul, that “a

man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law.” *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.37*

We have said that no work of ours, however perfect it may be, can stone for past transgressions; that even though we should be able to turn around and keep the law perfectly, that would not remove a single sin. As a matter of fact, however, it is impossible for the sinner to do any good work, even though it would be counted in his justification. “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” *Romans 8:7*. “The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that *ye cannot do the things that ye would.*” *Galatians 5:17*. This means, of course, while we are serving the flesh, and out of Christ; for Christ says, “Without me ye can do nothing.” *John 15:5*. This was said to those whose sins had been forgiven, and will certainly apply, with all its force, to those who have never know Christ. Christ says that “out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.” *Matthew 15:19*. These are the works of the flesh (see the complete list in *Galatians 5:19-21*), and are what men do by nature. Men may have good desires, but they cannot do what they would. *Galatians 5:17*. The law of God is so extensive and perfect in its requirements that the best efforts of fallen man, unassisted, must fall far short of it. And this thought makes us understand still more clearly the statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law; for every act that the man performs before he comes to Christ, no matter how good is intentions may be, only sinks him the deeper in condemnation. *SITI November 23, 1891, page 6.38*

“Not all our groans and tears,
Nor works which we have done,
Nor vows, nor promises, nor prayers,
Can e’er for sin atone.” *SITI November 23, 1891, page 36.1*

“Relief alone is found
In Jesus’ precious blood;
’Tis this that he is the mortal wound
And reconciles to God.” *SITI November 23, 1891, page 36.2*

And so the sinner, appalled at the multitude of his sins, which, like a mountain upon his back, well nigh sink him into despair, having lost all confidence in himself, may sin:—*SITI November 23, 1891, page 36.3*

“Just as I am-without one plea,
But that thy blood was shed for me,
And that thou bid’st me come to thee,
O Lamb of God, I come.”*SITI November 23, 1891, page 36.4*

“Just as I am-and waiting not
To rid my soul of one dark blot,
To thee, whose blood can cleanse each spot,
O Lamb of God, I come.”*SITI November 23, 1891, page 36.5*

November 30, 1891

“Justification and Sanctification” The Signs of the Times, 18, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

Having explained *Romans 3:28*, we are prepared to understand a parallel text that, without the explanation already given, might be considered a difficult one. The text referred to is *Romans 3:21*: “But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.” The righteousness of God, as we have already learned, is a term applied to the ten commandments, or, rather, by that righteousness which the ten commandments enjoin. But the question arises, “If the righteousness of God is the perfect righteousness which the law demands, how can it be manifested without the law?” Let Paul explain for himself, as he does in the following verses. “Even the *righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe*; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.” *Romans 3:22-25. SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.6*

By this we see that the righteousness of God which is manifested without the law, is simply the remission of sins that are just, for which no works of obedience on our part could make any satisfaction. Paul, speaking of Abraham, describes it as follows: “He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded, that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” *Romans 4:20-25. SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.7*

“Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” The same thing, says Paul, will be done to us also, if we also believe. The case, then, stands thus: The law demands perfect and unvarying obedience, but it speaks to all the world and finds none righteous; all have violated it, and all are condemned by it. *Romans 3:9-19*. Present or future obedience will not take away past transgression, therefore the law cannot help us. But Christ is perfect righteousness, for in him dwells “all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” Now God says that he will impute the righteousness of Christ to everyone who will fully believe on him. Impute means “to set to the account of.” Therefore we are to understand that whenever we accept Christ, his righteousness is set to our account. Thus “the righteousness of God” is manifested in our past lives, even though we ourselves have never done a single act of righteousness. So we have the wonder of perfect obedience to the law, without a single righteous act on our part. The righteousness of God without the law—Christ’s righteousness imputed to us. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.8*

But what is the law doing all this time? Has it relaxed its claims?—Not at all. Paul says, “The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, *being witnessed by the law*.” The law stands by and witnesses to the righteousness that is thus manifested in our past life. Whereas it before condemned us, now it justifies us, for in the righteousness that is imputed to us it can detect no flaw. It makes no difference to the law that the righteousness to which it witnesses is not the result of our own works; the righteousness is accounted as ours, and that satisfies the law. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.9*

Right here may profitably note the force of *Romans 5:20*: “Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” The “entering” of the law refers to the formal giving of it from Sinai, it did not exist in written form in the world. The remains of the law “written in their hearts,” and the translation of men who, like Enoch and Noah, walked with God, were what the people had to depend on for their knowledge of right and wrong. The law existed before that time, for sin was imputed to the people, and “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” But the law was given “that the offense might abound.” The

apostle does not mean that the law was given so that there might be more sin, but that it was given so that the sin which already existed *might abound*, that is, might appear greater than it did before. Paul expresses the exact meaning in another place when he says that sin, by the commandment, became “exceeding sinful.” *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.10*

To illustrate: Here stands a glass of water; it does not look perfectly pure, yet it does not seem very impure. Now a rod is thrust down to the bottom of the glass and given a few vigorous turns, when, behold, the water at once becomes exceeding foul. Did the rod make the water impure?—No; the impurity was there all the time; the rod simply made it appear. So there was sin in the world; but the law, when it was written on tables of stone, and copies could be multiplied in books, and scattered among the people, made the extreme hideousness of sin to appear. And why was this necessary? The answer is implied in the last clause of the verse: “But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” Men could not be saved while defiled by sin, even though they did not realize its heinousness. So the law was brought close to them, to show them their deformity, and make them feel their need of help from some source outside of themselves. And this effect it had; for no matter how much their sins were made to abound, “grace did much more abound.” Christ’s righteousness was seen to be sufficient to cover all the sins of the past. With Wesley, the repentant sinner may sing—*SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.11*

“Plenteous grace with Thee is found,
Grace to cover all my sin.” *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.12*

And with David, he can realize the blessedness of the man “whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered,” and unto whom the Lord will not impute iniquity. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.13*

We have seen that the law stands as a witness to the sinner’s justification. This shows that no act of Christ has in any way robbed the law of its force. Indeed, without the existence of the law there could be no such thing as justification. Now what about *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.14*

to the law? It is evident that unless he keeps it he will again fall into condemnation. The man's faith secured his justification; but that justification was simply the "showing to be just as conformable to the law." His justification was simply pardon for having violated the law; it was an act by which another's righteousness was put in place of his unrighteousness. Now, since "faith without works is dead," it follows as a necessary conclusion that if the man's faith was genuine (and if it were not he could not have been pardoned), it will now be proved by works of obedience. And therefore the characteristic of the justified man is just that he keeps the law. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.15*

Of Abraham it is said that his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. But James takes the same subject up and says, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" *James 2:21*. This is no contradiction of Paul's statement in *Romans 3:28*; for James immediately adds: "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." *Verses 22, 23. SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.16*

By this we see that Abraham's faith could not have been imputed to him for righteousness but for the disposition to work. And since justification has reference to the law of God, it is evident that the works that make perfect the faith that secures justification must be the works which the law requires. But this continued obedience is sanctification; for Christ prayed for his disciples: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." *John 17:17. SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.17*

Paul says that God has chosen us to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (*2 Thessalonians 2:13*); but that by which the Spirit acts is the word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit (*Ephesians 6:17*). *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.18*

Again Paul says, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." *Philippians 2:12*. But no one can accuse Paul of inconsistency; for he adds: "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." This is exactly in accord with our Saviour's words: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." *John 15:4, 5*. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 36.19*

Peter also bears the same testimony. He says: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." *1 Peter 1:22*. God's law is the truth (*Psalms 119:142*), and to purify is to cleanse from guilt or defilement, to sanctify. So Peter's sentence is that we are sanctified by obeying the truth; but he adds that this is done "through the Spirit." Sanctification, then, is the result of obedience; but as obedience is not simply a momentary act, but the work of a lifetime, it follows that sanctification is not an instantaneous, but a progressive, work. A man is justified as soon as he exercises true faith in Christ; but the work of sanctification goes on as long as there is any truth for him to obey. And since a man, after he has been justified by faith, would fall into condemnation if he should refuse to do any duty that was presented to him, and can only retain his state of justification by continuing in obedience to the law, it may be said that sanctification is but continued justification. Each new duty only makes the performance of others possible, and so "the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." *Proverbs 4:18*. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 52.1*

"Faith without works is dead;" and on the other hand, obedience without faith is impossible, as is shown by our Saviour's words in *John 15:4, 5*; also by the words of Paul: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." *Romans 8:8*. The man who is destitute of faith in Christ cannot keep the law, or do any act that is really good. In our best efforts there is so much imperfection that, but for the continual imputation of Christ's righteousness to make up for our deficiencies, we should be lost. The best that we alone can do is

bad. Without faith it is impossible to please God. *Hebrews 11:6*. And thus we see the force of the words, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." *1 John 5:4*. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 52.2*

"Where is boasting, then? It is excluded, By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith." *Romans 3:27*. The redeemed saint will have no cause for boasting over the lost sinner. True, the law, when applied to their lives, reports perfection in the one case, and only sin in the other; but the saint cannot boast, for without Christ he would have been nothing. If Christ had not put his own righteousness upon him, he would be in as hopeless a condition as the sinner. And to all eternity the redeemed host will join with the heavenly choir in saying: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." *Revelation 5:12*. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 52.3*

"That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." *1 Corinthians 1:29, 30*. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 52.4*

"And this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." *Jeremiah 22:6*. *SITI November 30, 1891, page 52.5*

December 7, 1891

“Christ the End of the Law” *The Signs of the Times*, 18, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

In the preceding articles we have considered the fundamental principles of the law, and all its bearings. We have by no means exhausted the subject, for that would be impossible; neither have we referred to all the texts relating to it; but we have given an outline of the nature of the law, its origin, perpetuity, extent of jurisdiction, and the relation to it of both righteous and wicked. By the principles of the law, which have already been enunciated, every text in the Bible that mentions the law may be explained; and, bearing those principles in mind, we shall now proceed to consider the application of some texts that are too often regarded as antagonistic to the law. Without a knowledge of the principles of the law, these texts may justly be considered as difficult; but with such knowledge, we find not only that they are in perfect harmony with those principles, but that they greatly strengthen the argument already made. Right here we will say that the task of “harmonizing” different portions of the Bible is one which no man has to perform. The different portions of the Bible were harmonized by inspiration; all that the expositor has to do is to point out the harmony that already exists. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 52.6*

In *Romans 10:4* we read as follows: “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth.” Before showing what this text means, it may be well to briefly show what it does not mean. It does not mean that Christ has put an end to the law; because (1) Christ himself said concerning the law, “I am not come to destroy.” *Matthew 5:17*. (2) The prophet said that instead of destroying it, the Lord would “magnify the law, and make it honorable.” *Isaiah 42:21*. (3) The law was in Christ’s own heart. “Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” *Psalms 40:7, 8*. And (4) since the law is the righteousness of God, the foundation of his government, it could not by any possibility be abolished. See *Luke 16:17*. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 52.7*

A reading of the verses preceding the one quoted should suggest its meaning: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." *Romans 10:1-3*. Bear in mind that "the righteousness of God" is his law. *Isaiah 51:6, 7*. We can see that Paul uses the term in this sense; for, without any break for explanation, he adds, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," etc. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 52.8*

From these verses we learn that Paul, instead of teaching that the law has come to an end, is showing that Israel, through ignorance, had failed to realize the design of the law in securing righteousness. What had caused this failure? Paul says it was because they were ignorant of God's righteousness, and went about to establish their own righteousness. They had such low views of the righteousness of God, as required by his law, that they thought they could make themselves righteous. But, as we have already seen, all men are sinful, and while in the flesh cannot please God. *Romans 8:8*. The only way in which men can appear as righteous, is to have that "righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ." When their faith is imputed to them for righteousness, they become, in Christ, new creatures (*2 Corinthians 5:17*), and thenceforth it is possible that with them all things shall be of God. But the Jews rejected Christ, and therefore failed to secure that righteousness which the law was designed to perfect in man. A comparison of Scripture texts will show that the view here outlined is the correct one. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 52.9*

The reader must know that the word "end" does not necessarily mean "termination." It is often used in the sense of design, object, or purpose. For instances where it is so used, see *James 5:11; John 18:37; Romans 14:9; Amos 5:18; Luke 18:1; Hebrews 13:7; 1 Peter 1:9*. In reading these texts no one would get the idea that faith is ended, or that the Lord had ceased to exist. So in reading *Romans 10:4*, even without an explanation, one need not suppose that "end" means cessation of existence. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.1*

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Now for a more detailed exposition of the text. In *1 Timothy 1:5* the same writer says: "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." The word here rendered "charity" is often rendered "love," and is so rendered in this place in the New Version. In *John 5:3* we read: "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;" and Paul himself says that "love is the fulfilling of the law." *Romans 13:10*. In both these texts the same word (*agapa*) is used that occurs in *1 Timothy 1:5*. Therefore we say that this text means, Now the design of the commandment (or law) is that it should be kept. Everybody will recognize this as a self-evident fact. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.2*

But this is not the ultimate design of the law. In the verse following the one under consideration Paul quotes Moses as saying of the law that "the man that doeth those things shall live by them." Christ said to the young man, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." *Matthew 19:17*. Now since the design of the law was that it should be kept, or, in other words, that it should produce righteous characters, and the promise is that those who are obedient shall live, we may say that the ultimate design of the law was to give life. And in harmony with this thought are the words of Paul, that the law "was ordained to life." *Romans 7:19*. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.3*

But "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and "the wages of sin is death." Thus it is impossible for the law to accomplish its design in making perfect characters and consequently giving life. When a man has once broken the law, no subsequent obedience can ever make his character perfect. And therefore the law which was ordained unto life, is found to be unto death. *Romans 7:10*. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.4*

If we were to stop right here, with the law unable to accomplish its purpose, we should leave all the world under condemnation and sentence of death. Now we shall see that Christ enables man to secure both righteousness and life. We read that we are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

Romans 3:24. “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” *Romans 5:1.* More than this, he enables us to keep the law. “For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” *2 Corinthians 5:21.* In Christ, therefore, it is possible for us to be made perfect—the righteousness of God,—and that is just what we would have been by constant and unvarying obedience to the law. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.5*

Again we read: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit... For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” *Romans 8:1-4. SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.6*

What could not the law do? It could not free a single guilty soul from condemnation. Why not?—Because it was “weak through the flesh.” There is no element of weakness in the law; the weakness is in the flesh. It is not the fault of a good tool that it cannot make a sound pillar out of a rotten stick. The law could not cleanse a man’s past record, and make him sinless; and poor, fallen man had no strength resting in his flesh to enable him to keep the law. And so God imputes to believers the righteousness of Christ, who was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, so that “the righteousness of the law” might be fulfilled in their lives. And thus Christ is the end of the law. *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.7*

But life is promised to the obedient, and as Christ enables his people to obey the law, he thus secures to them eternal life. Paul says that Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” *2 Timothy 1:10.* Christ himself says: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” *John 10:10.* “For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16.* And because Christ meets the end or design of the law which was ordained to life, he is called our life, as Paul says: “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye

also appear with him in glory.” *Colossians 3:4.SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.8*

To conclude, then, we have found that the design of the law was that it should give life because of obedience. All men have sinned and been sentenced to death. But Christ took upon himself man’s nature, and will impart of his own righteousness to those who accept his sacrifice, and finally, when they stand, through him, as doers of the law, he will fulfill to them its ultimate object, by crowning them with eternal life. And so we repeat, what we cannot too fully appreciate, that Christ is made unto us “wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” *SITI December 7, 1891, page 68.9*

December 14, 1891

“God in Government” *The Signs of the Times*, 18, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

Sunday, November 15, was a great day in Boston churches. It was the Sunday of the National W.C.T.U. Convention, and although there were no meetings of the association on that day, nearly all the pulpits of the city were occupied by the ladies of the union. In the evening Tremont Temple was well filled, the occasion being an address by Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, the W. C. T. U. “round-the-world missionary.” The subject as “God in Government.” It being the regular church service, the pastor, Rev. Dr. George C. Lorimer, presided, and the Rev. Joseph Cook offered the prayer. Only the first part of the address was devoted to the subject, the latter part being simply temperance statistics; but in that first part some points were touched upon that are worthy of note, not for the sake of refuting them, but to serve as a warning, that those who read may discern and avoid the fatal error which lies at the foundation of these modern schemes for so-called National Reform.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.10*

The speaker read *Isaiah 9:6, 7* for her text, and then said that God had instituted two kinds of government in the earth. The first was that of the family. But this kind of government was found to be a failure, and therefore God institute the theocracy, which lasted down through the time of the judges, until Israel rejected God by rejecting Samuel. The second form of government-the theocracy-is what the speaker, together with other National Reformers, hopes soon to see again established in the earth, and to this end they are laboring.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.11*

Right here let it be noted that the failure of family government is what leads to schemes to enforce morality by law. The design is that the State shall take the place of the parent, and do what the parent has failed to do. This fact was virtually admitted by the speaker, when she said that the theocracy was established because family government was a failure. But let it be borne in mind that the theocracy was not established because the family-

government scheme was a failure, for the theocracy existed no less in the days of Adam, Noah, and Abraham than in the days of Gideon and Samuel. Moreover, God has never set aside the system of family government. In the days of Samuel the priest Eli was sternly rebuked and punished by the Lord, “because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not.” *1 Samuel 3:15*. And the command for children to obey their parents in the Lord, and for parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is always in force. *SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.12*

It is a fact, however, that family government is in most cases a failure. And why?—Simply because the parents themselves do not fear God. The power of the gospel is not known. When God does not rule in the hearts of the parents, it is not to be expected that through them he should rule the children. It is because of this failure in family government that people want to establish a theocracy; but this shows that the longed-for theocracy is but a substitute for the gospel; for with it family government would be a success, and God himself would thereby rule. *SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.13*

After stating that the theocracy was in force until God was rejected in the person of Samuel, the speaker said that since then there have been only here and there spots where God’s right to govern had been recognized. One of those places was said to be England, under Cromwell, and it was stated that “for a brief time God ruled in Massachusetts.” The speaker expressed confidence that the time will soon come when the government shall again rest on the shoulder of Jesus Christ. I could not help wondering what the Baptist pastor, Dr. Lorimer, thought of the alleged government by God in Massachusetts. At the time referred to, Baptists were imprisoned and whipped, simply for refusing to have their children sprinkled. Is it not strange that professed Christians will at this day charge upon God the government of Massachusetts, at a time when barbarities were perpetrated that would disgrace Mohammed, and that a Christian woman can long for the return of such a time? *SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.14*

The question that naturally followed was, “How are we going to put the government on the shoulder of Jesus Christ?” Sure enough, how are we? The text says, “The zeal of the Lord of hosts will

perform this." The Father says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." *Psalms 2:8*. The Saviour declared that his kingdom is not of this world, and liened himself, in his return to the Father in heaven, to a nobleman going into a far country, "to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." *Luke 19:12*. He receives the kingdom from the Father, while he is in heaven, and then returns, "having received the kingdom." When Christ returns to this earth, it will be in his kingdom, sitting upon the throne of his glory. It is therefore a difficult task that the National Reformers have set for themselves, namely, that of putting the government on Christ's shoulder. They have undertaken a job which requires nothing less than the zeal and power of the Lord of hosts. Thus they, in their shortsightedness, put themselves in the place of God. This very thing stamps all human schemes to get God in the government of this world, to give the government to Christ, to put it upon his shoulder, etc., as simply a phase of that "man of sin," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." *2 Thessalonians 2:4*. In saying this I do not impugn the motives or the sincerity of those who are in this movement of so-called National Reform. They simply "know not what they do." If they had more confidence in the power of God, they would have less confidence in their own power. *SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.15*

But here is the answer to the question as to how we are to get the government upon Christ's shoulder; God could do it alone if he so planned. He is calling out of the world a seed to serve him, who will receive his law, and write it in their hearts. What does God mean by giving us those ten commandments? We must look to them as the guide of our moral conduct, and the nation must adopt them. Not one law must be left on the statute books but the ten commandments." They, it was stated, must be the basis of all legislation. This, it is claimed, would put God into the government. But right here is where the great evil of the whole scheme lies; it aims to make men perfect by law, and is therefore directly opposed to the gospel. Let us note, in brief, a few points where the plan to make the ten commandments the law of civil government is opposed to the Bible, and positively wicked. *SITI December 14,*

ITS RESULTS

1. It would constitute men judges of moral conduct. But we are absolutely forbidden to judge another. See *Matthew 7:1; Romans 2:1; 14:4; James 4:11, 12*. God alone is judge of morals, and this plan would put man in his place.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.17*

2. It would make men judges of the law of God. This again would be to put man in the place of God. And this would inevitably result in —*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.18*

3. A low standard of morals. Only the One whence the law came can know it perfectly. Man's conceptions of it is faulty. Not only we, but man's judgment of his fellows is necessarily faulty, because he can judge only from the outward appearance. But a man may appear very righteous outwardly, and yet be abominably corrupt within. Yet the judge is unable to read the man's heart, would have to decide that such a man is righteous,—that he is in perfect harmony with the law. Thus it would bring the standard of the moral law down to the level of man's action. Men would be taught that God's law is no greater in its requirements than what any man has the ability to do if he only has a mind to do it. But the Scripture tells us first "the law is spiritual," and hence that it cannot be known, must less done, by one who is not spiritual. To attempt to enforce obedience to the ten commandments is to ignore the Spirit of God.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.19*

4. It would be to enforce sin. The law is spiritual, and the natural man cannot know it. All that the law of God can do for a sinner is to show him that he is a sinner. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." The State could deal only with the law as interpreted by fallible men. But the highest idea that the natural man can get of the law of God is so far below the law as it actually is that his idea of the law is sin. That is, that which the natural man takes to be the perfect righteousness of the law is nothing but the reflection of his own evil heart. But this is all that the State could even attempt to enforce, therefore the attempt to make the ten commandments the law of the

land would be to see the machinery of the State to crowd out the gospel, by teaching men to trust to heathen human power for righteousness. This matter may be dwelt upon more at length at another time.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.20*

The speaker exhorted her hearers to see that “no man has your support for any office however small or large, who is not a man of faith and prayer.” The reader can imagine what an endless amount of prying, spying, judging, criticism, gossiping, scandal vending, etc., would result from such a scheme. A man’s standing in the church would have to be settled before election. No man would think of running for office without a certificate from his pastor; and the length, quality and fervor of his prayers would be canvassed on every street corner. Whether it would result in the would be candidate’s making long and fervent prayers on the street corners, to be seen of men, is not certain, but there can be no doubt but that a high premium would be placed on hypocrisy. The horde of hungry office seekers would speedily become men of prayer. As to the matter of faith, that could be settled only by an inquisition.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 68.21*

Sunday laws were declared to be a necessity, “because law is an educator, and prevents good people from doing wrong.” As an illustration, the lady stated that after the California Sunday law was repealed, she was in the southern part of the State, and to her horror she saw, as she was going to church on Sunday morning a man engaged in well digging. After the service she spoke to the pastor about it, and he replied, with a groan, “That man belongs to my church.” We were left to infer that if there had been a Sunday law to compel rest, that good man would not have committed the sin of digging a well on Sunday, but would have gone to church. So it seems that when men succeed to their own satisfaction in placing the government on the shoulder of Jesus Christ, the churches will be filled on Sunday. We cannot see how the adoption of the ten commandments as the law of the State could have anything to do with the observance of Sunday, but allowing that Sunday-keeping is declared necessary, what virtue can there be in Sunday-keeping of the man who keeps the day because the law compels him to do so.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 84.1*

As might be expected, California was cited as the terrible example of the result of no Sunday law. She said that “there was an epidemic of Sunday-breaking when the California Sunday law was repealed.” I was living in the state at the time, and could not discern the slightest difference. Moreover, at not time have I ever seen in any city in California so much work being done on Sunday as was being done between Tremont Temple and the hotel at which I stopped, at the very hour that Mrs. Leavitt was speaking.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 84.2*

It was quite a severe charge against the piety of the churches of the land, when Mrs. Leavitt, in her praise of the Christianizing effects of law, referred by the effects of the laws against gambling and against lotteries, which she said that all States except Louisiana have enacted. Said she, “I have spoken in churches built by lotteries that were managed by ministers. We don’t do that now.” I should not have ventured to say before that congregation that the churches of our country, ministers included, are kept from gambling in lotteries solely by fear of the civil law. Surely nothing more is needed to show the quality of the piety that is expected by even the most enthusiastic supporters of Christianity by law.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 84.3*

It is perhaps needless to add that, according to the speaker, all these “blessings” will fill our land as soon as the ballot is placed in the hands of woman. As I listened to the discourse, and thought of the thousands who, without a thought, accept such teaching as the truth of God, my inward thought was, Oh, that they might understand the gospel and see the truth as it is in Jesus! May God speedily send forth his light and his truth, to save well-meaning people from dishonoring him and his law.*SITI December 14, 1891, page 84.4*

December 21, 1891

“Lock that Door” The Signs of the Times, 18, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above very suggestive heading the Boston *Sunday Globe* (November 15) contained a strong editorial plea for universal Sunday observance. A Sunday newspaper pleading for Sunday observance is, in itself, enough of an anomaly to attract attention, but the article exhibits so clearly the object and results of Sunday legislation that it is worth reproducing entire:—*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.5*

“Lock that Door

“That is the store door, the shop and factory door, Saturday night.*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.6*

“And keep it locked while all enjoy one day of rest from this ceaseless toil for bread. Everybody says that, without necessarily going on to say one and the same thing as to how we shall even take this rest.*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.7*

“Let us not have debate about how men ought to pass the whole time on Sunday. The question is undoubtedly in solution: for good citizens and worthy Christian folk, too, are now to be heard protesting a liberty that is in marked difference from the standards of even five and twenty years ago. For better or for worse, let the question go for the moment.*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.8*

“But this is a pertinent question, far beyond the lines of creed or sect. Can the door be kept locked without the churches? If the churches should become empty, could Sunday be kept free from the encroachments of business? Someone has recently been observing Boston’s church attendance. Our town averages full as well as Western towns, and can probably endure comparison with any of her great sister cities east. But it becomes a very vital, a very serious question to the tired toiler. If church-going is relatively falling off, is our rest day in danger? Can the eager, active American

people keep a rest day as often as once a week without the strong alliance of the religious sentiment to claim and enforce it? For, mark it, one day in seven for knocking off work and neglecting money-making is a rather frequent and expensive demand on our time. The seven, more or less, legal holidays of the year are not without some ugly and restless enemies among financiers and manufacturers. Some grasping employers are constantly breaking over. 'To-morrow is Decoration day, eh? Come, men, what say you, work and take extra pay?' *SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.9*

"Sunday for rest cannot survive except conscience is on its side. This is the verdict of history among continental European races. But it is vastly truer of the active American people. The open church means the closed shop. The closed church, would mean the open shop. Educated young people who read this will instantly revert to classical times and the total failures repeatedly to set up and defend a seventh day as a rest day without religion to enforce it as a duty. *SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.10*

"Then shall we say that young fellow is a shirk who rides his bicycle all day Sunday? Well, shirk is a hard name. Still, isn't that about the size of it? He expects others to sustain the church that sustains his day of rest, while he never goes near to help. Can that be square dealing, citizen with citizen? Shirk is a harsh characterization. But really, now, what is the right word for the young life that throws the entire burden of preserving his day sacred from toil upon other young lives, presumably as weary as his own all the week, but uphold the church on Sunday? Church-goers insist upon the day for conscience' sake. The man who wholly secularizes the day-well does he make game of them as he sleepily watches these devotees of duty, and drawls out: "Go ahead, you dear dupes. This day is named Privilege. You feed Privilege and keep him alive, while I get on the bark of Privilege and ride.' *SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.11*

"It can be easily maintained that what religious service a man will sustain is his own affair. And it can be equally clearly shown that publicly ordered religious service, on some part of the day called Sunday, is the sole security of the day from secular greed and grasp. Why, then, is it one citizen's burden more than another's?

What of him who slips his neck out altogether? Let be man among men, and lift together reverently to sustain the day, which certainly came to us from religious men before us.*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.12*

“Emory J. Haynes.”

The thoughtful reader of the above will need to have his attention called to only a few points.*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.13*

It is said that the day can be kept free from business only as it is kept as a religious day, and not, as a mere holiday. This is true; the rush of business in this age of greedy for money-making would soon call the pleasure seeker into the shop. But the fact is that those who abstain from labor on Sunday, from religious motives, are greatly in the minority, and their proportion to the whole population is diminishing. Preaching does not seem to have any appreciable effect in propping up Sunday observance. Therefore it follows that the only way to lock the door against Sunday Labor is by compelling men by law to act as though they were religious when they are not. In other words, Sunday can be preserved as a general rest day only by compelling men to be hypocrites.*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.14*

This is further shown by the argument that regular church service and universal attendance are necessary to Sunday rest. Not the statement that “publicly-ordered religious service, on some part of the day called Sunday, is the sole security of the day from secular greed and grasp.” Therefore, the enforcement of Sunday rest means compulsory attendance on church service. Disregard for Sunday, means diminished church attendance, and this means diminished contributions for church support. Is not the last one secret of the effort to enforce Sunday observance? It must be; for if those who bewail slimly attended church services were thinking only of the spiritual loss to the absentees, they could go to the houses of the careless ones, and carry the gospel to them. Will the enforced attendance at church, which will follow enforced Sunday rest, mean also enforced support of the churches?*SITI December 21, 1891, page 84.15*

Finally, it is worth while to note how the one is regarded who does

not care to attend church on Sunday. If he mounts his bicycle for a little exercise, he is regarded as less than a man-a shirk. It is evidence from this that but little favor need be expected by those who do not choose to keep Sunday, when once it has been authoritatively declared that the safety of the State demands the preservation of religion, and that the preservation of religion demands the strict observance of Sunday. To too many poor souls the cry, "Lock that door!" will have a dread significance.*SITI*
December 21, 1891, page 84.16

December 28, 1891

“Conditional Immortality” *The Signs of the Times*, 18, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

What is meant by conditional immortality?—Simply this, that immortality, or eternal life, which is the same thing, is conditional upon the individual’s belief in Christ. It means that “the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” *Romans 6:23*. It is the doctrine which our Saviour himself taught, when he said: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” *John 3:36*. Or, as expressed by the apostle: “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” *1 John 5:11*. *SITI December 28, 1891, page 84.17*

It is the doctrine which Christ taught to Nicodemus in these words: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. It is the doctrine which gives Christ his rightful title of Life-giver, which he himself claimed, when he said: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” *John 10:10*. *SITI December 28, 1891, page 84.18*

To hear some men talk, one would get the idea that the doctrine of conditional immortality is rank infidelity, and utterly opposed to all true Christianity. As a matter of fact, it is based on the recognition of the fact that in all things Christ has the pre-eminence; that man can have nothing except as he gets it through Christ. *SITI December 28, 1891, page 84.19*

As a matter of fact, a denial of the doctrine of conditional immortality is to that extent a denial of Christ. Indeed, we may truly say that it is wholly a denial of Christ, since it denies the very thing for which Christ came. He himself declares that his only object in coming to this earth to die, was that men might, by believing on him have life. Now the man who says that eternal life is not conditional upon believing in Christ, virtually says that man has no need of Christ. This was just what so many of the ancient Jews did, to whom Christ

sadly said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." They did not profess to be Christians; they rejected Christ unreservedly. Is it not strange that in these days Christ is rejected in exactly the same way by those who profess to love and honor him? Why should people refuse to acknowledge that indebtedness to Christ for all that they have or hope to have?*SITI December 28, 1891, page 84.20*

1892

October 24, 1892

“The Testimony of the Bible to Itself” The Signs of the Times, 18, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

Some persons object that what the Scriptures say as regards their inspiration is not proper evidence—that we ought rather to have outside testimony concerning the Scriptures. It is true that ordinarily, in the case of a man, his own testimony concerning himself is not conclusive; but it is not so in the case of the Bible. We must either take its testimony concerning its own inspiration, or else reject it entirely. He who doubts its testimony on this point, will doubt it upon every point. Accepting the Bible as a book of truth, we must necessarily accept all that it says of itself. *SITI October 24, 1892, page 84.21*

We know that it speaks the truth when it tells us about ourselves, therefore we accept its testimony as true when it speaks of itself. The woman of Samaria said, “Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did, is not this the Christ?” So we know that the testimony of the Bible is the testimony of that same One. *SITI October 24, 1892, page 84.22*

The Pharisees found fault with Christ because he said, “I am the light of the world.” They said: “Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true. Jesus answered and said unto them; though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true; for I know whence I came, and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go...It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me.” *John 8:13-18. SITI October 24, 1892, page 84.23*

The Pharisees could not see the Father, and therefore they would not accept Christ’s testimony concerning himself. If they had believed Jess they would have *known* that his testimony was true. It is by faith that we understand. He who believes has evidence of the

strongest kind. He who believes God's word, accepting it not as the word of man, but as it is indeed, the word of God, knows that the Spirit of God is witnessing through it.*SITI October 24, 1892, page 84.24*

There is sufficient evidence to enable anybody to accept the Bible as the word of God, but the strongest evidence of all comes to the man after he has believed. This evidence can never be exhausted or measured, but becomes stronger the longer it is considered.*SITI October 24, 1892, page 84.25*

